

# FISCAL NOTE WORKSHEET (Revised Nov. 2006)

Agency: Utah State Office of Education  
Ben Leischman  
 Requested By

Bill Number SB 172

Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst  
 W310 State Capitol Complex  
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5310  
 538-1034 / Fax 538-1692

Fax/Electronic Mail Transmittal

Date: _____
Name: _____
Fax Number: _____

Please return to Fiscal Analyst by: January 29, 2007

**TITLE OF BILL:** MUNICIPAL LAND USE, DEVELOPMENT, AND MANAGEMENT CHANGES

This Bill Takes Effect: ☐ On Passage ☐ On July 1 ☒ 60 Days after session ☒ Other Governors

Bill Carries Own Appropriation: ☐

## FISCAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

### A. Revenue Impact by Source of Funds:

First Year

Second Year

	\$0	\$0
1. General Fund		
2. Uniform School Fund - Free Revenue		
3. Transportation Fund		
4. Collections		
5. Other Funds (List Below)		
6 Local Funds		
7. TOTAL	\$0	\$0

### B. Expenditure Impact by Source of Funds:

1. General Funds	\$0	\$0
2. Uniform School Fund - Free Revenue		
3. Transportation Fund		
4. Collections		
5. Other Funds (List Below)		
6 Local Funds		
7. TOTAL	\$0	\$0

### C. Expenditure Impact Summary:

1. Salaries, Wages and Benefits	\$0	\$0
2. Travel		
3. Current Expenses		
4. Capital Outlay		
5. Other (Specify)		
6. TOTAL	\$0	\$0

### D. Impact in Future Years?

*If no fiscal impact in first two years, indicate if there will be any impact in future years, and explain. Also, indicate any significant changes in fiscal impact beyond the first two years. Use back side, if necessary.)* This bill would have no further impact in future years than the first two years.

**E. Identify Sections of the Bill That Will Generate the Additional Workload or Cost Increase**

This bill would not significantly increase workloads.

**F. Expenditure Impact Details (*Ties to totals in Section C*)**

*List and document methodology and/or assumptions used in determining need for workload and cost increase.*

*List number, type, and step ranges of personnel required, including benefits.*

*List details of other impacted expenditure categories as shown in Section C.*

*List additional space requirements and cost associated with requirements of this bill.*

(USE ATTACHMENTS IF NECESSARY.) This bill would clarify some parts of planning and zoning law. This bill should be compared with HB 69 as they both are addressing the same topic and much of the language is the same.

**G. No Fiscal Impact or Will Not Require Additional Appropriations?**

*Specify why this bill will have no fiscal impact on your agency or institution.*

*Specify how you will reallocate workloads, resources, or funding sources to eliminate need for additional appropriations. (USE ATTACHMENTS IF NECESSARY.)* This should have no fiscal impact as it does not address any areas not currently being handled. It simply clarifies that Charter School receive the same privileges as school districts in planning and zoning situations.

**H. If Bill Carries It's Own Appropriation:**

*Indicate if the amount appropriated is adequate to meet the purposes of the bill.*

*Are there future additional costs anticipated beyond the appropriation in the bill?*

The bill carries no appropriation and none is needed.

**I. Impact on Local Governments, Businesses, Associations, and Individuals**

*Specify requirements in the bill that drive the impact on local governments.*

*Indicate costs or savings that are **DIRECT and MEASURABLE**. If direct and measurable data are not available, are there areas that potentially could have a fiscal impact? (USE ATTACHMENT IF NECESSARY.)*

Local School Districts/Charter Schools : This would allow Charter Schools to be treated as school districts in planning and zoning law. This is not a significant change.

Businesses and Associations :

Individuals :

**Narrative Description of Bill** : This bill clarifies the status of Charter Schools in planning and zoning law. It clarifies that they should receive the same considerations as a school district. It also would be implemented and become effective as soon as signed by the governor.